

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-32 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 13, and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been added to the amended claims.

Claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Landgren (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,754).

Claim Objections

Claim 10 was objected to because of the number 30 present in the claim. The reference to the number 30 has been removed as requested. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is in a condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "based on an analysis of the listing of client applications that are permitted to receive the location information." The Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment removes the antecedent basis problem presented by the prior recitation of "the analysis."

Claims 2 and 13 have been amended to remove the claim term "may." Support for the claims amendments is found in the specification, for example, at page 17, lines 1-5. The Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment removes the indefiniteness rejection of these claims.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-12

The claims are allowable because each and every element is not shown or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 1 recites, "a first memory configured for storing at least one privacy profile for at least one subscriber wireless communications device, wherein the privacy profile includes: identification information for the at least one wireless communications device and a listing of client applications that are permitted to receive the location information for the at least one wireless communications device." The Applicants

respectfully submits that the cited reference does not teach or suggest at least these elements of claim 1.

The claimed invention provides an individual privacy profile for a particular wireless device that includes a listing of particular client applications that are permitted to receive location information for the particular wireless device. Referring to figure 3, permission sets 324 are provided, for example, for three companies authorized by the subscriber to receive location information regarding the subscriber's wireless device. (Specification, p. 18, lines 8-18). Thus, embodiments of the present invention provide subscriber profiles for a wireless device that include a listing of client applications that have permission to receive location information for the wireless device. (Specification at p. 17, lines 2-5).

Landgren does not teach or suggest a privacy profile for a wireless communication device including a listing of client applications that are permitted to receive location information for the particular wireless communication device. Landgren merely discusses a process in which applications "request registration with the location appending unit." (Landgren at col. 8, lines 21-22). "Once the request is received, the location appending unit adds the URI to a URI database present in the location appending unit which is thereafter used in parsing communications passing through a coupled gateway." (Landgren at col. 8, lines 38-42). Permission for an application to receive location information is thus a global process in Landgren, applicable to all mobile units. In other words, at the registration phase, there is only global control over which applications are permitted to receive location information.

Moreover, the mobile unit's subscriber profile does not include information related to particular applications, but merely provides a binary (Yes/No) indicator for allowing location information to be appended to a communication. (Landgren at col. 8, lines 56-65). Landgren provides no discussion of a privacy profile for a wireless device that can be used to selectively allow a particular application to receive location information for the particular wireless device. Landgren merely discusses a mobile unit that either allows all authorized applications to receive location information or denies all authorized applications location information. Thus, at neither the registration level nor the subscriber profile level, does

Landgren teach or suggest a privacy profile for a subscriber wireless communications device that includes a listing of client applications that are permitted to receive location information for the particular wireless device. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 2-12, which depend from claim 1 are in a condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 1, as well as for the additional elements they recite.

Claims 13-24

Claim 13 recites, in part, "accessing a subscriber profile associated with the at least one wireless communications device in memory, wherein the subscriber profile includes an indication of which of the requesting client applications have been authorized to receive location information as well as at least one privacy preference which controls the manner in which the location information is provided" and "determining whether the requesting client application is included in the accessed subscriber profile for the at least one wireless communications device." The applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference does not teach or suggest at least these elements of claim 13.

As discussed in relation to claim 1, Landgren does not teach or suggest a subscriber profile associated with a wireless device that includes an indication of which of the requesting client applications have been authorized to receive location information for the particular wireless device. The registration process and subscriber profiles in Landgren merely provide global (applicable to all mobile units) authorization of a particular application and binary (Yes/No) control over whether an individual mobile unit will allow location information to be appended to a communication. Thus, Landgren does not teach or suggest providing an indication of which applications are permitted to receive location information for a particular wireless device. For at least these reasons, claim 13 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 14-24, which depend from claim 13, are in a condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 13, as well as for the additional elements they recite.

Claim 25-29

Claim 25 recites "receiving a request from a client application for location information for a wireless device" and "retrieving a subscriber profile from a memory, the subscriber profile including a listing of the client application and a permission set for the client application." As discussed in relation to claims 1 and 13, Landgren does not teach or suggest a subscriber profile including a listing of client applications and a permission set for a client application. The registration process and subscriber profiles in Landgren merely provide global authorization of a particular application and binary control over whether an individual mobile unit will allow location information to be appended to a communication. For at least these reasons, claim 25 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 26-29, which depend from claim 25, are in a condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 25, as well as for the additional elements they recite.

Claims 30-32

Claim 30 recites "a first memory adapted to store a subscriber profile for the wireless device, wherein the subscriber profile includes identification information for the wireless device and a permission set for at least one of the plurality of client applications." As discussed in relation to the previous independent claims, Landgren does not teach or suggest a subscriber profile for a wireless device that includes a permission set for a particular client application. The subscriber profiles discussed in Landgren merely provide binary control over whether an individual mobile unit will allow location information to be appended to a communication. There is no discussion of a permission set for each client application that is permitted to receive location information. For at least these reasons, claim 30 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 31-32, which depend from claim 30, are in a condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 30, as well as for the additional elements they recite.

Appl. No. 10/076,682
Amdt. dated March 10, 2006
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2143


PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,


Craig C. Largent
Reg. No. 56,400

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
CCL/mcg/ka
60685313 v1